26913

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | *THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE*

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Lilly Ann Selby

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* The Relationship Between Teacher Mobility and Alienation

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M. Ed.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. H. Zingle

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* Oct 31/75 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Lilly Ann Selby

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE* 9217 - 163 St
Edmonton
Alberta

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER MOBILITY AND ALIENATION

by

© LILLY ANN SELBY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Relationship Between Teacher Mobility and Alienation submitted by Lilly Ann Selby for the degree of Master of Education in Counselling Psychology.

.....
Supervisor

.....

.....

.....

Date Oct. 24, 1975

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine alienation as it existed among a representative sample of the teachers in Alberta in 1972. Dean's Alienation Scale was used to determine the levels of alienation expressed by respondents. A total of 382 usable questionnaires were returned out of 537 (71.11 per cent). Statistical analyses were done to determine if any characteristic of the group such as age, sex, position in school, mobility, etc. was related to the degree of alienation.

It was hypothesized that young teachers would be more alienated than older teachers. A second hypothesis was that teachers in urban areas would be more alienated than those in rural areas. A third hypothesis was that teachers in large schools would be more alienated than those in small schools. A fourth hypothesis was that those teachers who feel they have no influence over their jobs will be more alienated than those who feel they have some influence. A final hypothesis was that teachers who move frequently will be more alienated than those who remain in one school for a long time.

Hypothesis One was fully supported by the data. Hypothesis Five was found to be true for female teachers only. No support was found for Hypotheses Two, Three, and Four.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study owes a great deal to the help and encouragement of Dr. H. Zingle, thesis chairman, and members of the committee, Doctors, D. Satzky, W. Stewart, and A. Shysh. Special thanks to the many teachers throughout Alberta who took time to answer and return the questionnaires.

I dedicate the finished work to my daughter, Peggi Rieger, and my friend, Stanley J. Morse, without whose help it would not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM.....	1
	Background of Problem.....	1
	Criticism of Schools.....	1
	Urbanization.....	2
	Bureaucracies.....	2
	Mobility.....	3
	Purpose of Study.....	3
	Dean's Alienation Scale.....	4
	Definition of Terms.....	4
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	6
	Historical Roots of Alienation.....	6
	Hegel's Concept of Alienation.....	7
	Marx early Writings.....	8
	Fromm's concern with alienation.....	8
	Modern sociological approaches.....	8
	Alienation from work.....	10
	Bureaucracies and alienation.....	11
	Alienation of the young.....	12
	Mobility and alienation.....	13
	Alienation among teachers.....	14
	Hypothesis.....	16
III	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND PROCEDURE.....	18
	Sampling.....	18
	Procedure.....	18
	Dean's Alienation Scale.....	19

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Perceived influence scale.....	20
	Previous work experience.....	21
	Comparison of Sample to ATA Survey 1971.....	22
IV	RESULTS.....	24
	Comparison to previous studies.....	24
	Demographic characteristics.....	25
	Age.....	25
	Sex.....	27
	Marital Status.....	27
	Community Size.....	28
	Interaction Effects of Demographic Characteristics.....	30
	School-Related Variables.....	30
	Years of teaching experience.....	31
	Years in present school.....	32
	Mobility.....	32
	Position in school.....	34
	Years of teacher training.....	34
	Staff size.....	34
	Grade level.....	35
	Previous work experience.....	35
	Perceived influence.....	37
	Summary of results.....	38
	Summary table.....	40
V	SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION.....	41
	Hypothesis 1.....	41

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Hypothesis 2.....	41
	Hypothesis 3.....	42
	Hypothesis 4.....	43
	Hypothesis 5.....	43
	Discussion.....	44
	Implications.....	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		49
APPENDIX A - Letters and Forms.....		54
APPENDIX B - Tables.....		64

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY AGE.....	65
2	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TOTAL ALIENATION BY AGE.....	66
3	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE POWERLESSNESS BY AGE.....	66
4	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE NORMLESSNESS BY AGE.....	67
5	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOCIAL ISOLATION BY AGE.....	67
6	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY SEX.....	68
7	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY MARITAL STATUS.....	68
8	MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY MARITAL STATUS (REVISED).....	69
9	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TOTAL ALIENATION BY MARITAL STATUS.....	70
10	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE POWERLESSNESS BY MARITAL STATUS.....	70
11	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE NORMLESSNESS BY MARITAL STATUS.....	70
12	MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY COMMUNITY SIZE.....	71
13	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE NORMLESSNESS BY COMMUNITY SIZE.....	72
14	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE POWERLESSNESS BY COMMUNITY SIZE.....	72
15	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TOTAL ALIENATION BY COMMUNITY SIZE.....	73
16	MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY EXPERIENCE.....	74
17	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TOTAL ALIENATION BY EXPERIENCE.....	75

TABLE		PAGE
18	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOCIAL ISOLATION BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE.....	76
19	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE NORMLESSNESS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE.....	77
20	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE POWERLESSNESS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE.....	78
21	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY YEARS IN PRESENT SCHOOL.....	79
22	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOCIAL ISOLATION BY YEARS IN PRESENT SCHOOL.....	80
23	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY MOBILITY CATEGORIES.....	81
24	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOCIAL ISOLATION BY MOBILITY.....	82
25	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY MOBILITY CATEGORIES FEMALES.....	83
26	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY MOBILITY CATEGORIES MALES.....	84
27	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOCIAL ISOLATION BY MOBILITY (FEMALES).....	85
28	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TOTAL ALIENATION BY MOBILITY (FEMALES).....	86
29	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY POSITION.....	87
30	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS SCHOOL RELATED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	88
31	MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY TRAINING.....	89
32	MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY STAFF SIZE.....	90
33	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE POWERLESSNESS BY STAFF SIZE.....	91
34	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE NORMLESSNESS BY STAFF SIZE.....	92

TABLE		PAGE
35	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY GRADE LEVEL.....	93
36	MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONAL STATUS.....	93
37	t-TESTS ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONAL STATUS.....	94
38	MEAN SCORES ON PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY POSITION IN SCHOOL.....	95
39	MEAN SCORES ON PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY SEX.....	95
40	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY POSITION IN SCHOOL.....	96
41	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY SEX.....	96
42	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.....	40

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

The problem of alienation of man in modern society is the central theme of much that is written today in the fields of literature, philosophy, psychology, and sociology. Social criticism of our mass society finds evidence of the destructive influence of alienation in our institutions and in all levels of our interpersonal relationships. Studies have been done which point to the occurrence of this condition in various segments of our society including women, industrial workers, youth, voters, in fact all of us (Clark, 1959, and Dean, 1961).

As one of the most important institutions in our society, the schools of North America have been widely criticized recently as depersonalizing and dehumanizing. Educators such as Holt (1969), Kozol (1967), Kohl (1967), and Postman and Weingartner (1968) have eloquently pointed out the defects of current educational practices and suggested some of the ways in which schools could be changed to help meet the needs of children as human beings. There can be little doubt that many teachers also find schools unrewarding places to work. In the Province of Alberta alone, each year, between 14 and 21 per cent of all teachers leave the schools they were in, many to seek other types of employment (ATA, 1971). Stinnet (1970) in his study of teacher drop-outs cites lack of recognition for work well

done as the major reason for people leaving the teaching profession. According to Knoblock and Goldstein (1971) the core problem for the teachers in their study was "...a painful realization that they were separate from themselves, their children, and other adults in the school (p. 6)".

A number of circumstances in North American society contribute to the prevalence of alienation. The development of huge cities is one of the most frequently mentioned factors. At the turn of the century George Simmel observed that man was not a whole creature in the modern metropolis. He defined alienation as "...the collision between society and the individual (Josephson, 1962, p. 152).

A second development which influences levels of alienation is the growth of bureaucracies. To administer increasingly complex businesses and industries, elaborate chains of command have been developed. In the search for efficiency, these structures have all but eliminated the human element. Such bureaucratic control is now typical of our social institutions including school systems where financial accountability outweighs human need (Stinnet, (1970).

One of the effects of bureaucracy is a concentration of power at the top of the hierarchy and the resultant increase of powerlessness at the lower levels. Thus, many of the people in large organizations feel they have little or no control over events that affect them. Whether this is true state of affairs or only a person's subjective

evaluation of the situation is immaterial; his feeling remains the same.

A third social condition which works toward producing alienation is the increasing mobility of persons at all levels of society. Both geographic mobility and on-the-job mobility or shift work contribute to the loosening of ties which once bound a man to a group or community whose norms he understood and in which he had an established place. Now the need to "get ahead" can only be satisfied in many instances by people willing to tear up their roots and move for the sake of promotion. Our society is producing a new breed of unattached nomads.

It was concern about the increasing mobility of Alberta teachers that led the Alberta Teachers' Association to conduct intensive studies of geographic and occupational mobility among its members. This concern grew out of the findings of another ATA study, Profile of Alberta Teachers: Expectations and Heightened Aspirations, which revealed that teacher dissatisfaction was increasing (1966).

The purpose of this present study was to examine alienation as it existed among a sample of teachers in Alberta in 1972. An attempt was made to determine the relationship of alienation to the size of the community, position in school, mobility, sex, age, years of teacher training, and years of teaching experience.

Perceived influence was also examined to determine the relationship between the amount of power a person thinks

he has and how much alienation he feels.

For the purposes of this study, Dean's Alienation Scale (1961) was chosen to measure the dependent variables. This scale has three separate components: normlessness, powerlessness, and social isolation. It also yields a score for total alienation which is the sum of the three components.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Powerlessness

This term is most frequently used to describe alienation from work. Miller (1967) considers a person to be alienated if he does not find his job self-rewarding. It has been used also to describe job dissatisfaction or the feeling that one's work is meaningless. As used by Dean (1961) it has a broader application and is used to describe "...the feeling of an individual that he cannot understand or influence the very events upon which his life and happiness depend (p. 754)". It is thus a matter of perceiving one's life as being under the control of others.

Normlessness

This component of alienation refers to the rejection by the individual of the "...behavioral norms of the society --the common social expectations about the kind of behavior that is proper and appropriate (p.754)". It seems possible that failure to follow social norms can be the result of either conscious rejection of these behaviors or a lack of

of understanding as to what such behavior is. Dean (1961) has attempted to develop a scale which will measure the feeling of separation from group standards, the feeling of pointlessness, as well as the conflict of internal and social norms that result from such feelings.

Social Isolation

For some writers, 'loneliness' or the inability to maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships is a type of alienation. Middleton (1963) considers an individual to be expressing this form of alienation when he agrees with the statement "I often feel lonely". Dean (1961) has designed his scale to measure a feeling of separation from a group, low social participation, and a degree of felt rejection (p. 757).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

That alienation is not a distinctly modern phenomenon has been argued convincingly by a number of writers. The only point of disagreement amongst them is how far back one must go in order to find the true beginnings of man's estrangement from his fellows, his work, his gods, nature, and himself.

Walter Kaufmann, in his introduction to Schact's (1970) book, presents a cogent argument for considering Plato to have shown those characteristics which are now seen as belonging to the alienated. He removed himself from public life in his city because he thought it pointless to be involved. He rejected the world around him and pointed to salvation in a world beyond sense experience, change, and time. His arguments in favor of a soul divided into three parts which are often at odds with one another provide a vivid picture of estrangement from self.

A second suggestion for the historical beginnings of the modern experience of alienation is put forward by Murchland (1971). He argues at some length for placing these beginnings in the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance era. The writers of that time were involved with two major themes, the alienation of man from God through sin, and man as a homeless wayfarer on a journey to his final home in heaven.

Feuer (1963) advanced the theory that alienation could be traced back to Calvin and his concept of spiritual death as the alienation of the soul from God. He viewed this Protestant pessimism as the basis of Hegel's concept of alienation which in turn became a major influence on Marx.

The importance of Hegel's writings to the study of alienation is evident from the continual reference to and analysis of his works by modern writers on the subject. In his first major work, The Phenomenology of Mind (1807), he developed two concepts of alienation, the first referred to a separation between the individual and the social substance; the second to the surrender which was necessary if separation was to be overcome.

> He believed that alienation was fundamental in life because it is implied in every unfolding of the spirit; it is present whenever man makes an attempt to relate to the objective world... . The tension between what we are and what we should ideally be is the basis of Hegel's theory that alienation is the motor force of the dialectical struggle for wholeness (Murchland, p. 141, 1972).

From Hegel to the present time alienation has been the central concept in western man's intellectual searching. Kierkegaard and Nietzsche made it one of the central concerns of existential philosophy. Kafka (1920), Camus (1942), Laurence (1913), and other novelists painted vivid word pictures of man's loss of himself and meaningful relationships with others. Marx borrowed the concept of alienation and made it basic to a sociological consideration of man and his relationship to his fellow man and his world.

It was in Marx's early writing, The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, published first in 1933 and transported to North America by Erich Fromm in 1961, that the alienation of man was dealt with in detail. He saw alienation as an essential component of a capitalistic economic system, in that the products of man's labor were beyond his control and ultimately became more important than man.

> The worker becomes poorer the more wealth he produces, the more his production increases in power and extent... . The increase in value of the world of things is directly proportional to the decrease in value of the human world. Labor not only produces commodities. It also produces itself and the worker as a commodity. (Murchland, 1971, p. 157).

In such a system, not just the worker is alienated but the managers and owners as well. They become involved in a bureaucratic structure as manipulators of men as things. Thus, they too are alienated from their fellow men whom they relate to as things and from the products of their enterprises. Dehumanized and alienated, men in a capitalistic industrialized society begin to take on mechanized characteristics and become ever more thing-like.

Erich Fromm is probably one of the most fluent and prolific writers among the followers of Marx, as well as being the man most responsible for the popularization of the term alienation in North America. He published a translation of Marx's Manuscripts under the title Marx's Concept of Man and the concept of alienation is the central theme of

many of his own works. Fromm uses the term broadly to describe a great many conditions of human life and interaction including those of man with himself, man with others, man with nature and man with society.

In The Sane Society (1955), Fromm defines his concept of alienation as it exists in modern society.

> By alienation is meant a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as alien. He has become, one might say, estranged from himself. He does not experience himself as the center of his world, as the creator of his own acts--but his acts and their consequences have become his masters... . The alienated person is out of touch with any person (p. 110).

Fromm's proposals for ways in which man can change himself and his society, to become authentic instead of alienated, are found in two of his other works, The Art Of Loving (1956) and The Revolution of Hope (1968). The major theme is love as the productive relationship between human beings which is felt not just for another but for oneself and extends ultimately to include the whole world. In The Revolution of Hope he provides a blueprint for humanizing modern technological society into a federation of communities at work.

Since the mid-fifties alienation has become one of the major topics of concern in the literature of North American sociology. Writers in the field have been concerned with definitions of the concept. Having defined the concept, they then attempt to explain the historical

development of it and estimate its prevalence.

Many of the conditions which these writers see as contributing to the increase of alienation in our society are found in the relationship between people and their work. Marx was the first to be concerned with the alienating effect of working in an industrial society. He saw work which was extraneous to the worker or which was not personal to the worker and his needs as a human being as being alien.

Sociologists who are studying this condition now seem to be approaching the problem from varying perspectives. One of these is that described by Aiken and Hage (1966) as a feeling of disappointment with one's job. This feeling affects all levels of employment but seems particularly true for blue-collar workers whom Gerson (1965) describes as being servants of the machines. Swado's (1957) study found that the attitudes of automotive workers towards work were those of hatred, shame, and resignation.

Other sociologists have narrowed this definition of alienation to describe a feeling that there is no intrinsic reward associated with the work one does. Miller (1967), in his study of industrial scientists, found that the most alienated of them were those who did not experience pride in their work and were working merely for their salaries. Middleton (1963) describes estrangement from work as existing when a man fails to realize his own human capacity to its fullest and works only to earn money for the other things that he wants.

Alienation from one's work can also be defined as a feeling of dissatisfaction with the degree of control one has over one's work. "Any free man must have some influence in the determination of the nature and content of his work or purposeless behavior and critical neuroses are inevitable". Miller (1967) found that freedom of research choice was more important than specific professional incentives for job satisfaction among industrial scientists.

Seeman (1967) states that the conditions of a mass society encourage a sense of powerlessness which leads an individual to be insensitive to and uninformed about an environment over which he believes he has little control. He did a number of studies which supported this thesis. For example, in his study of hospital patients (1962), he found that those patients who scored highest on a measure of felt powerlessness knew the least about matters important to their health. Again, among inmates of a reformatory, he (1963) found that those inmates who felt most powerless were able to learn the least from a series of lectures about the parole system and how they could use it to benefit themselves.

For many people in our society, this feeling of powerlessness is associated with the bureaucratic structure inherent in modern business and industry. Such bureaucracies encourage an increase in the concentration of power at the top and thus increase the separation between people at various levels of the hierarchy. This, according to Gerson (1965), encourages coercion and manipulation, in short, it

makes a commodity of man.

Bureaucracies are increasingly typical of social institutions as well as businesses. Aiken and Hage (1966) did a study of sixteen welfare organizations and found all to be essentially bureaucratic in their structure. The most significant finding in this study was that organizations where rules were strictly enforced had the most highly alienated employees. This alienation from work was intensified when the employees did not participate in the decision-making process.

Further evidence of the alienating effects of bureaucracies is found in Pearlin's study (1962) of nursing personnel. He found that the greater the hierarchical disparity between the controlled and the controller, the greater the degree of alienation felt by the person who was controlled. Coupled with this feeling of alienation was an overtone of resentment at being deprived of greater control over their own work.

Clark (1959) did a study in which he found that the more powerless members of an organization feel, the more likely they are to express dissatisfaction with the organization. This dissatisfaction was related to the lack of involvement of the members in the decision-making process.

In the complex organizations of our society, the young are also frequently deprived of involvement in the decision-making process. That the young of our society are alienated has been a matter of growing concern for many

years. According to Mitchell (1971), the alienation of youth is not only an experience but part of our contemporary cultural design (p. 51). Kenniston (1960) blames the social and cultural situation created by a highly successful industrial society for the present extent of alienation among the young people of America. He sees the direction of cultural change being away from commitment and enthusiasm and toward increasing alienation and apathy. Penner (1970), in his study of alienated high school students, found them engrossed in studies of mystical religions and the occult, uninvolved and uninterested in the world around them.

David (1955), in his study of Harvard college students, found them to be egocentric, anxious, and gloomy in regard to their future. Halleck (1967), in his work with alienated college students, found them unable to communicate with their parents or any other adults, and totally unwilling to make any commitment to people, causes or ideas.

Physical mobility is now one of the accepted facts of life in North American society with approximately one-fifth of the population moving every year. Toffler (1970) predicts a society in which only the readily mobile can expect economic success and in which stable community and family relationships will be virtually eliminated. Several recent studies have found that high spatial mobility and job turnover are related to increased alienation. Dean (1961) found these characteristics in subjects who expressed feelings of

Social Isolation or "a feeling of separation from the group or of isolation from group standards". Pearlin (1962) found that rotating shift work, where the individual had no constant group of associates, was characterized by higher alienation scores.

Very little direct evidence is available concerning levels of alienation among teachers. Inferences, can, however, be drawn from a number of related studies. For example, evidence that teachers share feelings of dissatisfaction with their work can be found in the ATA's survey done of people leaving the teaching profession each year. More than twenty-five per cent of those taking up other occupations gave as their reason "Fed up with teaching".

Stinnett (1970), in his study of causes of teachers dropping out of their profession, found that the feeling that there was no intrinsic reward existed. Low morale among teachers was most frequently attributed to the conviction that no one takes the trouble to give a little praise for a job well done.

With the growth of cities and the reorganization of school districts through centralization, the administration of schools in North America has become increasingly bureaucratic. The superintendent is employed by the board of education to implement policies which it has initiated. The superintendent translates these policies into directives to the school principal, who in turn passes these orders on to the classroom teacher. There is little machinery

in such a system which adequately allows the classroom teacher to become involved in any of the decisions which affect his work. As Stinnett (1970) has noted, "The typical American teacher may well be lagging behind the professional churchman in the level of decision-making influence which he enjoys (p. 6)".

Stinnett (1970) also found that many young teachers leave the profession after a short time. He found this to be particularly true of creative and innovative individuals who are unable to adjust to the restrictive demands of the bureaucracy. These people tend to be itinerant, and after moving from school to school, seeking a situation that allows them sufficient freedom and job satisfaction, give up their profession.

The Alberta Teachers' Association conducts yearly surveys of Geographic and Occupational Mobility of Alberta Teachers. Between 1968 and 1971, the percentage of teachers leaving their current positions varied from 21 per cent to 13.9 per cent. Of these, 44.5 per cent in 1968 to 28.7 per cent in 1971 were seeking teaching positions in other places. Among the reasons listed on the questionnaire, those most frequently chosen were husband transferred, seeking better working conditions, and a more responsible position. However, each year, more than one-third of these mobile teachers move for none of these reasons, choosing instead the unspecified category "other" to explain their actions.

From the evidence found in the literature cited, a number of hypotheses can be drawn:

1. Because Stinnett (1970) found that most of the teacher drop-outs were young, and because the ATA study, Profile of Alberta Teachers: Expectations and Heightened Aspirations, 1968 found that teacher dissatisfaction was increasing among young teachers, it is hypothesized that "Young teachers will feel more alienated than do older teachers".

2. As already mentioned in Chapter I, the growth of large cities is a significant contributing factor to the prevalence of alienation in modern society. Therefore, it is hypothesized that "Teachers who live and work in rural areas will be less alienated than those who work in cities".

3. Based on the assumption that there will be more inter-personal communication in small schools, it is hypothesized that "Teachers who work in small schools will be less alienated than those who work in large schools".

4. Miller (1967), Seeman (1967) and others have shown that feelings of alienation are decreased when a person feels they have some control over their own work. Therefore, it is hypothesized that "Teachers who feel they have no influence over what happens in their school will be more alienated than teachers who feel they are involved in the decision-making process".

5. Since high mobility and job turnover are related to high levels of alienation, it is hypothesized that "Teachers who move frequently will be more alienated than those who remain in one school for a long time".

CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND PROCEDURE SAMPLING

A systematic sampling procedure was used to obtain a representative sample from the 1971-1972 Alberta teaching force. The mailing list of the Alberta Teachers' Association containing approximately 20,000 names was used as a source of subjects. According to Hayes (1965), a minimum of 384 cases are necessary to provide a representative sample from a large population. Since previous studies of a similar type have shown that approximately seventy per cent of the questionnaires would be returned, it was determined that a sample of about 500 would be sufficient. By random selection, the eleventh name was drawn from the ATA mailing list and every thirty-seventh name thereafter. This yielded a total sample of 537 names. This list is compiled by Counties and Divisions rather than alphabetically so that rural and urban teachers are proportionally represented in the sample.

Each name on the list was assigned a code number which was entered on the questionnaire and Personal Data Form (See Appendix A) that were sent out. As the completed questionnaires were returned, the names were checked off on the master list. Approximately one month later, a follow-up letter (See Appendix A) and a second copy of the questionnaire and Personal Data Form was sent to each person who had not replied by that date.

The questionnaire that was sent out consisted of Dean's Alienation Scale and a five question Perceived Influence Scale developed by the author. The Personal Data form requested information regarding sex, age, marital status, previous work experience, training, etc.

Dean's Alienation Scale

Dean's Alienation Scale was used as the measure of alienation. This scale is a 24-item Likert-type instrument which yields a total score for the general syndrome of alienation as well as scores for the three sub-scales of 'normlessness', 'powerlessness', and 'social isolation'.

Dean's Alienation Scale was chosen for this study for a number of reasons. First because normlessness, powerlessness, and social isolation are important elements of the alienation syndrome and those most likely to affect the effectiveness of a teacher.

Second, some of the questions are scored in reverse order, thus avoiding to some extent a mental set on the part of the respondents.

Third, the length of the scale --24 questions-- seemed adequate to test the variables without being so time consuming that busy teachers would simply refuse to answer it.

Fourth, it is general enough in content to be used with any group of adult subjects.

Dean (1961) reported reliability of the powerlessness subscale tested by the split-half technique as being

0.78 (N=384) when corrected by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. Similarly obtained reliabilities for the normlessness and social isolation sub-scales were 0.73 and 0.84 respectively. Dean (1961) stated that "The total Alienation Scale had a reliability of 0.78 when corrected" as above (p.756).

Each subject was asked to respond to the scale by checking one of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree for each of the statements. The responses were scored from one to five with five representing the greatest degree of alienation for items 5, 8, 11, 14, and 22. All other items were scored with reverse weighting. A copy of this scale may be found in Appendix A.

Perceived Influence Scale

In order to assess how much influence teachers reported having in their everyday work, a series of six questions (yes-no) was developed by the writer. These questions were submitted to a group of twenty teachers and graduate students for criticism. This group felt that the question "Are teachers in your school involved in making decisions about discipline?" was too vague to be included and that the yes-no format was unsuitable (See Appendix A). As a result of these suggestions, a five question scale was adopted. The answer format was changed and subjects were asked to respond by checking one of always, frequently, seldom, or never for each statement. This model was presented to a different group of teachers and graduate students

for suggestions who agreed that the questions were clear as to meaning and did assess all major areas of decision making by teachers (See Appendix A). The scale was scored from one to four with four representing 'always'.

There were a number of comments written about these questions on the forms that were returned. Several elementary school teachers who had very low scores on the scale stated that such questions did not apply to elementary schools. A number of teachers in one-room schools did not answer at all since they felt that this section did not apply to them. There were, however, no comments to the effect that these questions were ambiguous.

Previous Work Experience

Each respondent was also asked for information about any jobs they had had lasting longer than six months. Each job was then rated according to the Pineo-Porter Canadian Occupational Prestige Scale to determine whether these jobs had higher status than teacher or lower status than teaching. This scale contains 204 occupational titles that were rated on social standing by a sample representing the entire Canadian population (Pineo and Porter, 1966). A score of one was given for occupations with a higher status, a score of two was given for occupations with a lower status and a score of three was assigned to persons with no previous occupation.

A total of 398 (74.11 per cent) of the questionnaires were returned but only 382 (71.11 per cent) were usable since

sixteen were returned unanswered or so incomplete as to be without value for the study. Of the usable questionnaires, 311 were responses to the first mailing and seventy-one came after the follow-up letter had been mailed. Four were returned by the Post Office as address unknown.

To determine if the sample was in fact representative, it was compared in as many aspects as possible with the 1971 Survey of Geographic and Occupational Mobility of Alberta Teachers done by the Alberta Teachers' Association. This survey questionnaire had been sent to all teachers in Alberta and returned completed by 79.3 per cent.

Comparison of the Sample to ATA Survey of September, 1971

	Sample (Per Cent)	Survey (Per Cent)
Sex		
Male	39.27	38.34
Female	60.73	61.36
Age		
21	0.0	0.06
21-25	17.01	15.3
26-30	23.2	23.0
31-35	15.4	18.0
36-45	15.4	15.9
46-55	17.0	14.9
55	11.5	11.5
Years of Training		
1	10.9	12.3
2	11.2	17.2
3	14.4	12.6
4.	39.5	38.0
5	13.3	12.4
6	5.76	6.2
6	4.7	1.3

Years of Teaching Experience		
1- 5	34.6	36.5
6-10	25.1	22.7
11-20	20.7	22.6
21	19.6	17.5
Grade Level Taught or Supervised		
Elementary	51.8	50.1
Jr High	23.8	24.7
Sr High	21.9	20.7
Other	2.3	4.0

Since no significant differences exist between the total population of teachers in Alberta and the sample used in this study, it seems fair to say that the sample is representative.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The overall results on Dean's scale will be considered first. Scores on total alienation may range between 24 and 120. The mean for the sample in this study was 61.29. With all items scored so that a score of 5 in each case indicates that the respondent feels strongly alienated, 1 that he or she does not feel alienated at all, and 3 that the respondent is undecided about his or her response to the item in question. The scale's mid-point is 72. Individual scores on this measure varied widely, from a minimum score of 28 to a maximum of 109. The standard deviation for this group was 11.94.

Previous studies using this scale have shown similar results. A sample of males (N-384) in Columbia, Ohio, (Dean, 1960) had a mean score of 57.1, while a later study (Dean, 1968) involving both males and females found a mean score for males of 61.1 and for females a mean of 64.3.

Each specific component of Dean's scale -- normlessness, powerless, and social isolation were considered for the group as a whole. On the powerlessness scale, the sample mean was 23.68 with a standard deviation of 5.43. In the previous studies mentioned above, the means on this sub-scale were found to be much the same. For the males in Columbia the mean was 22.7, while in the study in 1968 the males scored a mean of 23.6 while the females mean was 24.6. Results on the normlessness sub-scale for this

study was 12.19. For the males in Columbia the mean had been found to be 13.6, and for the 1968 study males had a mean of 14.4 and females a mean of 14.6 on the normlessness sub-scale. Finally on the social isolation sub-scale the mean for the group in this study was 23.55 with a standard deviation of 4.91. The males in Columbia had scored a mean of 20.8 on this sub-scale, while the males in the 1968 study had a mean of 23.3 and the females had a mean of 25.1. The results of studies using this scale have been quite consistent over a period of ten years.

The respondents in this study differed widely as individuals on a number of school-related and demographic characteristics. An attempt was made to determine whether these different characteristics affected the amount of alienation that was expressed by persons in the study. Demographic characteristics, age, sex, and marital status, were examined first to determined how these related to scores on the total alienation measure and on it's sub-scales. Each factor was considered in turn and then the possible interaction effects among these variables was considered.

Age

Ten response categories were provided for the question asking the respondent to indicate his or her age. No respondent fell into the first category (under 21). Table 1, Appendix B, shows the mean alienation score for each successive age group. An inspection of these means

indicated that alienation decreases with age. The score for the youngest group was 63.82 and for the oldest group 57.00. An analysis of variance (Table 2, Appendix B) done on total alienation by Age of Respondent showed a main effect significant at the .05 level: $F(2,373)=3.93$. To examine the specific way in which alienation scores change from one age group to the next, trend analyses was done on these data. As Table 2 shows, a significant linear trend appeared as well, $F(1.8)=8.69$, $p < .005$. In general, as age increases, the amount of alienation reported by respondents showed a progressive decrease.

Similar results were found on powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. The mean scores by age group on each of these measures appear in Table 1. In the case of powerlessness, the effect of age is significant at the .01 level $F(2,373)=4.69$, as shown on Table 3, Appendix B. For normlessness, it was significant at the .05 level: $F(2,373)=3.93$. And finally, the effect of Age of Respondent on social isolation was significant at the .01 level: $F(2,373)=4.63$. These results are found on Table 4 and Table 5 in Appendix B. In each case significant linear trends also appeared. As Table 4 indicates, the linear trend in the case of normlessness was significant at the .01 level: $F(1.8)=7.04$. For powerlessness, this effect was significant at the .05 level: $F(1.8)=3.93$ and for social isolation it was significant at the .005 level: $F(1.8)=8.77$.

SEX

Whereas age and alienation were strongly related, whether the respondent is male or female was of no consequence. Table 6, Appendix B, shows the mean scores of men and women on each of the dependent measures. In all cases, male and female means were similar, therefore no further analysis of these data was done.

MARITAL STATUS

Marital status like age was related to alienation but in a rather unexpected way. There were four "marital status" groups: (a) single persons who have never been married (b) persons currently married, (c) those who are divorced or separated, and (d) widows and widowers. Mean scores for the dependent measures for each group appear on Table 7, Appendix B. It might have been expected that married people would differ from single people. This, however, was not the case. The mean for married respondents was 60.74 and for single respondents 61.24. These two groups were far less alienated than the two remaining groups--the separated and divorced, with a mean of 66.81, and the widows and widowers, with a mean of 65.60. The same pattern appeared on each of the sub-scales comprising the total alienation score. It seemed then, as though those who <u>have been</u> but were <u>no longer</u> married felt much more alienated than those who were <u>now</u> married or who had <u>never been</u> married. Loss of a marital relationship seemed to be associated with high alienation. Simply being single versus being married was of little import.

To analyse this pattern further, the sample was divided into two groups (a) those who have been but are no longer married, and (b) those who were now married or had never been married. The mean total alienation score for the first groups was 66.42 and for the second 60.83 (see Table 8, Appendix B). Regrouped in this way Marital Status had a significant main effect on total alienation: $F(1,374)=4.52$, $p < .05$ (Table 9, Appendix B).

Interestingly enough, the significant effect just noted for Marital Status when only two categories are considered can be attributed entirely to the normlessness and powerlessness sub-scales. On normlessness, this effect was significant at the .005 level: $F(1,374)=5.90$ and on powerlessness at the .05 level: $F(1,374)=2.95$. These results are shown on Tables 10 and 11, Appendix B. The Scores on the social isolation sub-scale were unaffected by Marital Status.

COMMUNITY SIZE

One factor which might, however, be expected to relate to social isolation was the size of the community in which a person lived. Many commentators (Simmen, Fromm and others) have suggested that people who live in large urban areas are more likely to feel alienated from their fellows. Respondents were asked to indicate the size of the community in which their school was located. It was assumed that this was also the community in which they lived. Table 12, Appendix B, shows mean scores on each of the dependent

measures by the size of the community in which the respondent works.

Interestingly enough, social isolation was unrelated to community size. Analysis of variance bore this out. Size of Community did not produce a significant main effect on social isolation; trend analysis also revealed no significant effects. As with marital status, the size of the community in which the person was involved had no impact upon how friendly or hostile the social environment was perceived as being.

Powerlessness and normlessness scores, on the other hand, seemed more sensitive to immediate environmental influences. It has already been seen that marital status produced a significant effect on these two sub-scales. So did community size, but in a surprising direction. As Table 12 demonstrates, as the size of the community in which a person worked increased both powerlessness and normlessness decreased. In the case of normlessness, an analysis of variance (Table 13, Appendix B) showed no significant main effect nor was there a significant linear trend in these data. The impact of community size on powerlessness was more substantial. Now both a significant main effect and a significant linear trend appeared (Table 14, Appendix B). The main effect is significant at the .05 level:$F(5,372)=2.86$, and the linear trend at the .001 level:$F(1,5)=11.53$.

Given these differential effects of community size on the three sub-scales, it was to be expected that community

size would not be strongly related to total alienation. In fact, no significant main effect was found. There was, however, a significant linear trend, $F(1,5)=5.88$, $p < .05$, (see Table 15, Appendix B). Alienation decreased as community size increased.

INTERACTION EFFECTS

Since significant effects for some of the demographic characteristics were found on the measures under investigation, it seemed worthwhile to determine if such effects operated independently or if what had been found was the result of the combination of two or more of these variables. For instance, did alienation always decrease with age or did it decrease as a result of getting older and moving to a larger community? To get at whether such combination effects existed in this study, tests of interaction were done for sex, age, marital status and community size on the dependent measures. On none of the dependent measures were significant interaction effects of any sort recorded. We can thus conclude that the results found were independent of each other in a statistical sense. In other words the younger people in this sample were more alienated than the older people.

In contrast to the demographic characteristics that have just been considered, the other variables which differentiate between the respondents in this study were unique to the teaching profession. A number of these are age-related--years of teaching, experience, years in

present school, the number of times a person has moved from school to school and, to a lesser extent, position in school. Therefore, the effect of this group of variables on the dependent measures was considered next.

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Table 16, Appendix B, shows the mean scores on each of the dependent measures according to the number of years a respondent had worked as a teacher. There seemed to be a progressive decrease in total alienation as teaching experience increased, from 63.21 for those with one to five years of teaching experience, to 52.82 for those with between twenty-five and thirty years of teaching experience --and then a rise to 57.50 for those with more than thirty years of experience. An analysis of variance, Table 12, Appendix B, shows a significant effect for teaching experience on total alienation, $F(6,375)=2.59$, $p < .05$. There was also a significant linear trend, $F(1,6)=9.66$, $p < .005$ found in these data.

These results can mainly be attributed to the social isolation sub-scale. Here there was both a significant main effect and a significant linear trend: $F(6,375)=3.93$, $p < .001$ and $F(1,6)=6.14$, $< .001$ respectively (Table 18, Appendix B). School personnel, in other words, felt less isolated as the number of years they had been teaching increased.

Teaching experience had less impact on normlessness and none upon powerlessness. For normlessness, the main

effect for teaching experience was significant at the .05 level: $F(6,375)=2.33$ and the linear trend at the .05 level: $F(1,6)=6.36$ (Table 19, Appendix B).

YEARS IN PRESENT SCHOOL

If educators felt less isolated the longer they had been teaching, they might also have been expected to feel less isolated the more years they had spent in a given school. This issue was examined by looking at the effect on social isolation of the number of years a respondent had been in his or her present school. While years in present school showed no main effect on social isolation (Table 22, Appendix B) a significant linear trend did emerge $F(1,6)=5.25$, $p < .95$. The more time a person had spent in his or her current school, the less isolated he or she felt. Powerlessness and normlessness scores recorded neither significant main effects nor significant linear trends. The number of years a person had been in his or her current school did not affect the total alienation score significantly.

MOBILITY

The extent to which respondents had changed schools over the course of their career was assessed by asking each person to list the number of schools in which he or she had worked. This number was then divided into the length of time a respondent had been teaching and the resultant "mobility" measure split into five approximately equal categories.

The scores ranged from .66 for people who had moved very frequently to 18 for those who had been extremely stable. Mean scores on each dependent measure for each mobility group are shown on Table 23, Appendix B. Social isolation was the only measure that was found to be affected by the degree of mobility a respondent had reported. Here, no main effect emerged, but a significant linear trend was found: $\underline{F}(1.4)=3.74$, $\underline{p} < .05$ (See Table 24, Appendix B).

It is interesting to observe further that mobility has an impact upon social isolation for females but not for males. Table 25 and Table 26 in Appendix B reveal that as mobility increased so did social isolation for female respondents. In this instance there was both a significant main effect and a significant linear trend: $\underline{F}(4,220)=2.83$, $\underline{p} < .05$ and $\underline{F}(1,4)=6.94$, $\underline{p} < .01$, respectively (Table 27, Appendix B). The total alienation score for females also showed a significant linear trend for mobility: $\underline{F}(1,4)=4.01$, $\underline{p} < .05$ (Table 28, Appendix B). Powerlessness and normlessness scores for females were not affected by mobility. When only males were considered, all significant effects for mobility disappeared. In short, female educators who moved around a great deal felt more isolated than those who remained longer in one locale. Mobility had no comparable effect on their male colleagues.

POSITION IN SCHOOL

The position that a person occupies within the school hierarchy also depends in part on age and in part on the amount of training that the person as acquired. Table 29, Appendix B, shows the mean scores on the dependent measures of the respondents grouped by position within the school. Inspection of these data show that the counsellors in this sample had the lowest scores on all measures of alienation which were used. However, the number in this group was too small to be satisfactorily compared statistically to the group of teachers in the sample. Analysis of variance showed no significant results for any of these data.

YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING

The amount of training a person has is related significantly to the position that he or she holds in the school, $r = .13$, $p < .01$ (Table 30, Appendix B) so that it might be expected that this variable also would have no effect on the dependent measures under consideration. Inspection of the mean scores for this variable, shown on Table 31, Appendix B, shows this to be the case. No further analysis of these data was done.

STAFF SIZE

Mean scores on each dependent measure for schools of various sizes are shown in Table 32, Appendix B. Inspection of these data suggested that there could be a significant

relationship between staff size and powerlessness and also total alienation. A weak relationship between powerlessness and staff size was found, no main effect but a significant linear trend: $F(1.8)=4.87$, $p < .05$ was found, (See Table 33, Appendix B).

Curiously, staff size has no impact upon social isolation, that is, respondents felt neither more nor less isolated in large schools than in small ones. Normlessness though was linked to staff size, but here, only a significant main effect appeared: $F(8,373)=2.26$, $p < .05$ (Table 34, Appendix B) indicating that this relationship was quite irregular. The total alienation score showed no significant effect of any kind.

GRADE LEVEL

The next school-related factor considered was the grade level at which the respondents were working. There was no particular reason to suspect that grade level should be related to alienation. In fact scores on none of the dependent measures vary significantly with grade level. The mean scores for respondents in elementary schools, junior high schools and senior high schools are shown on Table 35, Appendix B.

PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE

It was decided to assess whether those people who became teachers after having had some experience with other types of work were more satisfied with their work and lives than those people who had come into the teaching profession

with no other experience than that of having been students themselves. The sample was divided into two groups--one composed of respondents who had worked at some other occupation before becoming educators, and the other of those who had never followed any other line of work. Table 36, Appendix B, shows the scores on each dependent measure for each group.

The mean normlessness score for respondents who had only worked as educators was 14.45 and for those who had previously worked in some other field it was 13.51. A t-test was done (see Table 37, Appendix B), the results of which showed that the difference between these two groups was significant: $t(216.44)=-2.16$, $p<.05$. Similar results were found for powerlessness where the effect of previous work experience was significant at the .05 level: $t(221.36)=-1.99$. These results support the notion that individuals who choose to become teachers after having previously tried other occupations felt that they could in general exert more control over their own lives. They felt more powerful and less normless than those who had always worked in a school system.

Social isolation showed no relationship to previous work experience. The total alienation score for the group with previous work experience was found to be significantly different from the score of those who had never worked. A t-test showed this difference to be significant at the .01 level: $t(236.32)=-2.45$.

PERCEIVED INFLUENCE

Many of the studies of the degree of alienation expressed by people in other occupations, found that the less influence a person felt he had, the more alienated he was. In this study, an attempt was made to determine how much influence over their professional activities educators think they have. Respondents were asked how frequently teachers in their school helped select the courses and the subjects they teach, and how involved teachers were in program and instructional planning, and in the formulation of administrative policies. A higher score on this measure indicated that the respondent felt that he or she had a greater degree of influence in these areas. The mean score for teachers on this measure of perceived influence was 13.66 and for administrators the mean score was 14.68. An analysis of variance showed no significant main effect, but a significant linear trend: $F(1,3)=3.99$, $p < .05$ was found in these data, indicating that the higher one goes in the hierarchy of the school the more influence one perceived oneself to have.

Men also believe that they have more influence than did women. As Table 39, Appendix B indicates, the mean score for male respondents on the influence measure was 14.17 and for the female respondents it was 13.44. An analysis of variance showed that there was a significant main effect for sex of respondent on perceived influence, significant at the .01 level: $F(1,373)=6.50$ (Table 41, Appendix B).

Perceived influence correlated negatively with powerlessness, $r=-.11$, $p < .05$. Respondents who believed teachers have influence over what happens in the school felt more powerful than those who believed teachers play a less important role. Both normlessness and social isolation were not significantly related to perceived influence. The total alienation score was also not significantly related to the score on the measure of perceived influence.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

To summarize, in this thesis an attempt was made to discover what factors affect the scores which educators in Alberta obtained on Dean's Alienation Scale and on its three sub-scales tapping powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. The following results were found:

1. The mean score for the educators in Alberta on Dean's scale were essentially the same as those obtained by other populations with whom the scale had been used.
2. Educators expressed a lesser degree of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation as they get older.
3. Educators who have been but are no longer married were more alienated than either those who were currently married or those who were single.
4. Educators who lived in large communities expressed less powerlessness and normlessness than did those who lived in smaller communities.
5. Total alienation decreased as years of teaching

experience increased, mainly due to lessened feelings of social isolation and normlessness.

6. The longer a teacher remained in one school, the less isolated he or she felt.

7. Female educators who moved frequently from school to school felt more isolated than those who remained for a number of years in one school. The same was not true for male teachers.

8. People who had worked in other occupations before becoming teachers scored lower on measures of normlessness and powerlessness than did those who had not.

9. Male educators perceive themselves as being more influential than did female educators. Also administrators perceived themselves as being more influential than did teachers.

A further discussion of these results and the implications of same are found in Chapter V.

TABLE 42

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	NORMLESSNESS	POWERLESSNESS	SOCIAL ISOLATION	TOTAL ALIENATION
AGE	$<.05$	$<.01$	$<.01$	$<.05$
SEX	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
MARITAL STATUS	$<.005$	$<.05$	n.s.	$<.05$
COMMUNITY SIZE	n.s.	$<.05$	n.s.	n.s.
YRS OF TEACHING EXP	$<.05$	n.s	$<.001$	$<.05$
YEARS IN PRESENT SCHOOL	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
MOBILITY-total sample	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
MOBILITY-females	n.s.	n.s.	$<.05$	n.s.
POSITION IN SCHOOL	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
YRS OF TEACHER TRAINING	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
STAFF SIZE	$<.05$	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
GRADE LEVEL	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
*PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE	$<.05$	$<.05$	n.s.	$<.01$
PERCEIVED INFLUENCE	n.s.	$<.05$	n.s.	n.s.

* t-test results

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This study investigated the following five hypotheses as found in Chapter II:

1. Young teachers will be more alienated than older teachers.
2. Teachers who live and work in rural areas will be less alienated than those who work in cities.
3. Teachers who work in small schools will be less alienated than those who work in large schools.
4. Teachers who feel they have some influence over their working conditions will feel less alienated than those who feel they have no influence.
5. Teachers who move frequently will be more alienated than those who remain in one school for a long time.

Hypothesis Number 1 was supported by the results of this study. The analysis of variance that was done comparing the means of the different age groups showed that a significant difference at the .05 level existed. Trend analysis was also done which showed a linear trend significant at the .005 level. In other words the older teachers were less alienated than the younger teachers in this sample.

Not only was there no support for Hypothesis Number 2, but there emerged strong evidence that for the powerlessness sub-scale, the reverse was true. Teachers living and working in large communities felt more powerful

than did those in small communities. Since these results were a direct contradiction of results found in previous studies made with other populations, it appeared that in the case of teachers some other factors must be operating. Consideration of some of the specific items of the powerlessness sub-scale, for example, "It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a little child" and "There is little chance for promotion unless a man gets a break", may provide some possible explanation. In a smaller community, it is probably the case that school personnel do, indeed, feel that their actions are more closely monitored and controlled by others than in a larger community. It is certainly true that promotional opportunities are more limited in a small community. This could account, in part, for the strong negative relationship between community size and powerlessness.

Hypothesis Number 3 was based on the assumption that closer inter-personal relationships would exist among teachers on a small staff than among teachers on a large staff. This should result in teachers on small staffs feeling less alienated. This, however, is not what the results of this study showed. There were no significant differences between the scores on social isolation obtained by teachers in small schools and teachers in large schools. One possible explanation for this effect could be that teachers in larger schools were able to form small subgroups made up of people with similar interests. For example, in large high schools the teachers in a department

share a common work room in which they can meet both formally and informally. There are also curriculum committees on which teachers with similar interests can associate while working on a common task.

There was limited support for Hypothesis Number 4. The sub-scale which measures powerlessness correlates negatively ($r=-.11$, $p < .05$) with scores on the perceived influence scale. Thus teachers who believe they had some influence over what happened in their schools felt less powerless than those who felt they had no influence. It is interesting to note that administrators perceive teachers as being more influential in the running of the schools than did the teachers themselves.

The relationship between scores on the perceived influence scale and the powerlessness sub-scale was not strong enough to have an effect on the total alienation scores. Thus, no significant relationship between perceived influence and total alienation was found.

There was also limited support for Hypothesis Number 5, but only in the case of the female respondents. High mobility among females was found to correlate with high scores on the sub-scale measuring social isolation. This relationship was strong enough to affect total alienation scores for females so that a linear trend, significant at the .05 level was found. In other words, the more frequently a female teacher moves, the more alienated she felt.

One possible explanation for this difference between males and females who were mobile may be the element of choice in moving. The male teacher who transfers from one school to another does this in order to find better working conditions or for the sake of a promotion. On the other hand, a number of the females who move from one school to another do this because their husband has been transferred. For such women, then, there has in fact been no choice.

DISCUSSION

This study attempted not only to find support for the five specific hypotheses but also to investigate the relationship, if any, between alienation among teachers and a number of other factors. In Chapter IV, these factors were divided into two categories--those which affect people in general and those which were specific to the teaching profession.

The factors in the first category included sex, age, marital status and community size. Of these, only sex did not have some significant effect on the total alienation scores obtained by the respondents.

The factors in the second category included years of teaching experience, years of teacher training, years in present school, size of staff, position in school, grade level, mobility, previous work experience, and perceived influence. A number of these factors are age-related, for example, years of teaching experience, years in present

school and position in school. Of the remaining factors, only previous work experience and perceived influence showed any relationship to total alienation. It is clear then, that it is not the school-related factors which contribute to alienation among teachers but those same demographic characteristics that teachers share with all other human beings.

The study did not show any conclusive evidence that teachers as a group feel any more alienated than might any other sample of the population. However, from the comments written on approximately 20 per cent of the questionnaires, it would appear that many teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs. There are a number of statements indicating that teachers felt they had little or no control over their working conditions. For example, "Decisions are made by the Department of Education", "The administration decides what we do", "Sometimes I help with instructional planning", "I frequently feel like a cog in the machinery of the school".

As pointed out in Chapter I, the schools are being sharply criticized for failing to meet the needs of children as human beings. Holt (1967) points out that children learn their attitudes at least in part from their teachers. Given this, it would appear that alienated teachers will produce alienated children. If schools are to become more humanized, something must be done to lessen alienation among teachers. The results of this study point out that the factors influencing levels of alienation among teachers are factors

relating to their needs as human beings. It is these factors then, which must be considered if alienation among teachers is to be reduced.

Two recent studies which attempted with some success to help teachers overcome feelings of powerlessness and isolation were done by Field (1970) and Knoblock and Goldstein (1971). In both these studies, unstructured group experiences were provided for the teachers involved. During these sessions the teachers were encouraged to air their problems and work toward more positive relationships with their peer group. In both these studies, the participants became significantly less alienated as a result of their group experience. These sessions also provided the teachers with an opportunity to become actively involved in finding solutions to their own problems. The results of these studies also showed that teachers who felt they had some influence over their own lives felt less alienated than those who felt powerless. As Etzioni (1969) has pointed out, in order to achieve social change in an organization the members must be involved in the shaping and reshaping of the structure of that organization (p. 327).

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

One aspect of this study which failed entirely in its purpose was the scale of perceived influence. It did not differentiate those who were highly alienated from those who were not. Probably the questions did not elicit answers

that related to personnel job dissatisfaction since the questions were worded so they could be applied to teachers in general rather than to the specific individual who answered the questionnaire. A more fruitful line of investigation might be to examine job expectations of people just entering teaching and check at the end of one year to determine how well these had been met.

Field's (1970) and Knoblock and Goldstein's (1971) studies suggest that some type of group experience may be helpful in reducing levels of alienation among teachers. In order to determine what type of group experience is most effective in reducing and maintaining reduction of alienation, a longitudinal study using groups of teachers matched for levels of alienation might be undertaken. One group would be provided with a highly structured, task-oriented group experience, focusing on solving specific problems each teacher is faced with, while another group could be provided an unstructured, personal development group. A control group, given no group experience, should also be included. Using Field's model, levels of alienation would be tested before the group experience, immediately after the group experience, and again six months or a year after the group experience.

A number of different approaches could be taken in attempting the aforementioned research. For example, the group experience could be of a short, intensive nature or could be an ongoing thing over a school year. The group

could be run in a single school for the entire staff, or separate from the school and involve teachers from many schools. The group experience could be directed by a person from outside the school or one of the teachers from the school could be trained to run the group. The group experience could be compulsory or voluntary for the persons involved. It is clear that much more research is needed in this area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AIKEN, MICHAEL & HAGE, JERALD. Organizational alienation: A comparative analysis. Am. Soc. Rev., 31:497 - 507, 1966.

ALBERTA TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION. Geographic and Occupational Mobility of Alberta Teachers, Monogram, Sept. 1971.

ARMSTRONG, HENRY GRAHAM. A conceptual model of the dysfunctions of bureaucracy, teacher alienation and anomie. M.Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

BURROWS, DAVID. Alienation: A Casebook, Thomas Y. Coswell Co., New York, 1969.

CLARK, JOHN P. Measuring alienation within a social system. Am. Soc. Rev., 24:849 - 52, 1959.

DANELIUK, CARL. An empirical study of the alienation and organizational integration of teachers. M.Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

DAVIDS, ANTHONY. Alienation, social apperception and ego structure. J. of Consulting Psychology, 19:21 - 27, 1955.

DAVIDS, ANTHONY. Generality and consistency of relations between the alienation syndrome and cognitive processes. J. of Ab. & Soc. Psych., 51:61 - 67, 1955.

DEAN, DWIGHT, G. Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. Am. Soc. Rev., 26:753 - 58, 1961.

DEAN, DWIGHT, G. Alienation and Marital Adjustment. Soc. Quarterly, 9, 2, 186 - 192, Spring, 1968.

DEAN, DWIGHT, G. Anomie and a comparison of a Catholic and a Protestant sample. Sociometry, 25, 2, 209 - 212, June, 1962.

ETZIONI, AMITAI. Man and society: The inauthentic condition. Human Relations, 22:325 - 332, 1969.

FEUER, LEWIS. What is alienation? The career of a concept. New Politics 1:116 - 34, 1962.

FIELD, JAMES A. Decreasing Alienation by Human Relations Training. Unpub. M. Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

FROMM, ERICH. The Sane Society. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York, 1955.

GERELICK, WINSTON. Alienation and Its Supercession: The Views of Marx, Fromm and Goodman. Unpub. M.Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

GERSON, WALTER. Alienation in Mass Society. Some Causes and Responses. Sociology and Social Research, 49:143 - 52, 1965.

HAJDA, JAN. Alienation and integration of student intellectuals. Am. Soc. Rev. 26:758 - 77, 1961.

HALLECK, SEYMOUR L. Psychiatric Treatment of the Alienated College Student. Am. J. of Psychiatry, 642 - 650, Nov., 1967.

HAYS, WILLIAM L. Statistics for Psychologists, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York, 1963.

HOLT, JOHN. How Children Fail. Dell Pub. Ltd., New York, 1964.

HOLT, JOHN. How Children Learn. Dell Pub. Ltd., New York, 1970.

HORTON, JOHN. The dehumanization of anomie and alienation: A problem in the ideology of sociology. Br. J. of Sociology, 15:283 - 300, 1964.

JOSEPHSON, ERIC & MARY (EDS). Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society. Dell Pub. Ltd., New York, 1962.

KENISTON, KENNETH. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965.

KENISTON, KENNETH. Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.

KENISTON, KENNETH. Alienation and the decline of utopia. Am. Scholar, 29:161 - 200, 1960.

KING, PEARL. Alienation and the individual. Br. J. of Soc & Clin. Psychology. 7:81 - 92, 1968.

KOHL, HERBERT. 36 Children, Signet Books, New York, 1967.

KOZOL, JONATHAN. Death at an Early Age, Bantam Books, New York, 1967.

KNOBLOCK, PETER & GOLDSTEIN, ARNOLD P. The Lonely Teacher, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1971.

LEFCOURT, H. M. Belief in personal control: research and implication. J. of Ind. Psych. 22:185 - 195, 1966.

LOKEN, J. Some psychological correlates of alienation. Unpub. M. Ed. Thesis, University of Calgary, 1968.

LOWRY, RITCHIE. The functions of alienation in leadership. Sociology and Social Res., 46:426 - 35, 1962.

MCCLOSKY, HERBERT & SCHAAR, JOHN. Psychological dimensions of anomie, Am. Soc. Rev. 30:14 - 40, 1965.

MIDDLETON, RUSSELL. Alienation, race and education. Am. Soc. Rev., 28:973 - 77, 1963.

MILLER, GEORGE A. Professionals in bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers. Am. Soc. Rev., 32:755 - 68, 1967.

MINTON, H. L. Contemporary concepts of power and Adler's views. J. of Ind. Psych. 24:46 - 55, 1968.

MITCHELL, JOHN J. Adolescence Some Critical Issues. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Toronto, 1971.

MURCHLAND, BERNARD. The Age of Alienation. Random House, New York, 1971.

NEAL, ARTHUR & RETTIG, SALOMON. Dimensions of alienation among manual workers and non-manual workers. Am. Soc. Rev., 28:599 - 608, 1963.

NEAL, ARTHUR & SEEMAN, MELVIN. Organizations and powerlessness: A test of the mediation hypothesis. Am. Soc. Rev., 29:216 - 226, 1964.

NEAL, ARTHUR & RETTIG, SALOMON. On the multidimensionality of of alienation. Am. Soc. Rev., 32:54 - 64, 1967.

NETTLER, GWYNN. A measure of alienation. Am. Soc. Rev. 22:670 - 77, 1957.

NISBET, R. The Quest for Community. New York: Oxford, 1953.

PAPPENHEIM, FRITZ. The Alienation of Modern Man. Monthly Review Press, New York, 1959.

PEARLIN, LEONARD I. Alienation from work: A study of nursing personnel. Am. Soc. Rev., 27:314 - 326, 1962.

ROBINSON, J. P. & SHAVER, P. R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, Publication Division, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbour, Michigan.

SCHACHT, RICHARD. Alienation. Doubleday and Co. Inc., Garden City, New York, 1970.

SEEMAN, MELVIN. On the meaning of alienation. Am. Soc. Rev., 24:783 - 91, 1959.

SEEMAN, MELVIN. Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. Am. J. of Soc., 69:270 - 84, 1963.

SEEMAN, MELVIN. Powerlessness and knowledge: A comparative study of alienation and learning. Sociometry, 30:105-23, 1967.

SEEMAN, MELVIN & EVANS, JOHN. Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. Am. Soc. Rev., 27:772 - 82, 1962.

SIMMONS, J. L. Some intercorrelations among alienation measures. Social Forces, 44:370 - 2, 1966.

SROLE, L. Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. Am. Soc. Rev., 21:709 - 16, 1956.

STREUNING, ELMER & RICHARD, ARTHUR M. A factor analytic exploration of alienation, anomie, and the authoritarian domain. Am. Soc. Rev., 30:768 - 776, 1965.

STINNETT, T. M. The Teacher Dropout. F. E. Peacock Pub. Inc., Itasca, Illinois, 1970.

SYKES, G. (ED.) Alienation: The Cultural Climate of our Time. New York: Braziller, Inc., 1964.

ZILLER, ROBERT C. The alienation syndrome: A triadic pattern of self-other orientation. Sociometry, 32:287 - 300, 1969.

ZURCHER, LOUIS A., MEADOW, ARNOLD & ZURCHER, SUSAN LEE. Value orientation, role conflict, and alienation from work: A cross-cultural study. Am. Soc. Rev., 30:539 - 548, 1965.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS AND FORMS

9317 163 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
May 3, 1972

Dear Fellow Teacher:

The enclosed questionnaire deals with a study I am doing as a graduate student in Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta. This study under the supervision of Dr. H. Zingle is required for the completion of my thesis in the M. Ed. program.

This research project is concerned with attitudes of teachers and the relationship of these attitudes to some characteristics of teachers such as years of training, experience, grade level, mobility, etc.

I would be grateful if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me, in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided, at your earliest convenience. Your name is not required since the information will not be dealt with as individual cases.

Thanking you in advance for your co-operation:

Yours truly

(Mrs) Lilly Ann Selby

9317 163 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
May 30, 1972

Dear Fellow Teacher:

A questionnaire concerning teacher attitudes was sent to you about three weeks ago. If you have returned this please accept my thanks. If you have not please complete the duplicate copy enclosed and return it at your earliest convenience.

The success of this and other similar projects depends on the co-operation of the respondents.

Yours truly,

(Mrs) Lilly Ann Selby

First Form of the Perceived Influence Scale

1. Are you involved in decision making about students in in your school?

   yes ____ no ____

2. Are you involved in decisions in your school regarding:

   (a) Program planning

   yes ____ no ____

   (b) Instructional planning

   yes ____ no ____

3. Are teachers in your school involved in making decisions about discipline?

   yes ____ no ____

4. Do teachers in your school help select courses to be taught?

   yes ____ no ____

5. Do you have some choice in the subjects you teach?

   yes ____ no ____

6. Are the grades you assign to students the ones they receive?

   yes ____ no ____

Final Form of Perceived Influence Scale

1. In your school teachers help select the courses to be taught:

   Always_____ Frequently_____ Seldom_____ Never_____

2. In your school teachers choose the subjects they teach:

   Always_____ Frequently_____ Seldom_____ Never_____

3. In your school teachers are involved in program planning:

   Always_____ Frequently_____ Seldom_____ Never_____

4. In your school teachers are involved in instructional planning:

   Always_____ Frequently_____ Seldom_____ Never_____

5. In your school teachers are involved in formulating administrative policy:

   Always_____ Frequently_____ Seldom_____ Never_____

PERSONAL DATA FORM

1. Sex

Male ____
Female ____

2. Marital Status

Married ____
Single ____
Divorced or Separated ____
Widow or Widower ____

3. Age

Under 21 ____
21 - 25 ____
26 - 30 ____
31 - 35 ____
36 - 40 ____
41 - 45 ____
46 - 50 ____
51 - 55 ____
56 - 60 ____
61 - ____

4. Years of teacher training as evaluated for salary purposes

1 year ____
2 years ____
3 years ____
4 years ____
5 years ____
6 years ____
More than 6 years ____

5. Years of teaching experience

1 - 5 ____
6 - 10 ____
11 - 15 ____
16 - 20 ____
21 - 25 ____
26 - 30 ____
More than 30 years ____

6. How long have you been in your present school

1 year ____
2 years ____
3 years ____
4 years ____
5 - 10 years ____
11 - 15 years ____
16 - more ____

7. Number of staff members in your current school including principal

4 or less ____
5 - 9 ____
10 - 14 ____
15 - 19 ____
20 - 24 ____
25 - 30 ____
31 - 50 ____
51 - 100 ____
100 - more ____

8. What is your main position in the school

Principal ____
Vice-principal ____
Co-ordinator or Department Head ____
Teacher ____
Counsellor ____
Other _____ (Specify)

9. Grades which you teach or supervise (mainly)

Elementary ____
Jr High School ____
Sr High School ____
Other ____

PERSONAL DATA FORM (continued)

10. Please list in order, the schools at which you have taught, size of staff and years you taught there

SCHOOL	LOCATION			YEARS	SIZE OF STAFF	GRADES TAUGHT
	City	Town	Prov			
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						

11. Have you had any other jobs lasting longer than six months, if so, what were they?

_____
_____
_____

12. Size of Community in which you teach:

Less than 500 ____ 1001 - 2000 ____ 5001 - 50,000 ____
501 - 1000 ____ 2001 - 5000 ____ 50,000 or more ____

13. In your school teachers help select the courses to be taught

Always _____ Frequently ____ Seldom ____ Never ____.

14. In your school teachers choose the subjects they teach

Always _____ Frequently ____ Seldom ____ Never ____

15. In your school teachers are involved in program planning

Always ____ Frequently ____ Seldom ____ Never ____

16. In your school teachers are involved in instructional planning

Always ____ Frequently ____ Seldom ____ Never ____

PERSONAL DATA FORM (Continued)

17. In your school teachers are involved in formulating administrative policy

Always ____ Frequently ____ Seldom ____ Never ____

PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Below are some statements regarding public issues, with which some people agree and others disagree. Please give us your own opinion about these itesm, i.e, whether you agree or disagree with the items as they stand.

Please check in the appropriate blank, as follows:

____A (Strongly Agree)
____a (Agree)
____U (Uncertain)
____d (Disagree)
____D (Strongly Disagree)

1. Sometimes I feel all alone in the world.
__A __a __U __d __D

2. I worry about the future facing today's children.
__A __a __U __d __D

3. I don't get invited out by friends as often as I'd really like to.
__A __a __U __d __D

4. The end often justifies the means.
__A __a __U __d __D

5. Most people today seldom feel lonely.
__A __a __U __d __D

6. Sometimes I have the feeling that other people are using me.
__A __a __U __d __D

7. People's ideas change so much that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on.
__A __a __U __d __D

8. Real friends are as easy as ever to find.
__A __a __U __d __D

9. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a little child.
__A __a __U __d __D

10. Everything is relative, and there just aren't any definite rules to live by.
__A __a __U __d __D

11. One can always find friends if he shows himself friendly.
__A __a __U __d __D

12. I often wonder what the meaning of life really is.
__A __a __U __d __D

PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

13. There is little or nothing I can do towards preventing a major "shooting" war.
__A __a __U __d __D

14. The world in which we live is basically a friendly place.
__A __a __U __d __D

15. There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up".
__A __a __U __d __D

16. The only thing one can be sure of today is that he can be sure of nothing.
__A __a __U __d __D

17. There are few dependable ties between people any more.
__A __a __U __d __D

18. There is little chance for promotion on the job unless a man gets a break.
__A __a __U __d __D

19. With so many religions abroad, one doesn't really know which to believe.
__A __a __U __d __D

20. We're so regimented today that there's not much room for choice even in personal matters.
__A __a __U __d __D

21. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.
__A __a __U __d __D

22. People are just naturally friendly and helpful.
__A __a __U __d __D

23. The future looks very dismal.
__A __a __U __d __D

24. I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd like.
__A __a __U __d __D

Found in Robinson & Shaver, Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, pp. 191 - 194.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

TABLE 1

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY AGE

AGE	NORMLESSNESS Mean	SD	POWERLESSNESS Mean	SD	SOCIAL ISOLATION Mean	SD	TOTAL ALIENATION Mean	SD
21-25 (67)	14.75	3.60	24.31	5.14	24.76	5.56	63.82	11.68
26-30 (93)	14.53	3.82	24.65	5.33	24.04	5.15	62.70	12.31
31-35 (59)	13.86	3.88	23.07	5.69	24.00	4.15	60.66	11.33
36-40 (22)	14.46	3.73	23.50	5.80	24.82	4.91	63.32	12.18
41-45 (35)	14.89	3.64	23.60	5.16	22.43	4.43	61.00	11.21
46-50 (31)	14.10	5.10	22.94	5.27	21.94	4.95	59.03	12.98
51-55 (32)	14.13	3.97	23.59	5.65	23.38	5.02	61.09	12.41
56-60 (25)	12.24	3.18	21.92	4.49	21.60	3.85	55.44	8.74
61- 0 (18)	12.61	4.68	23.00	7.27	21.50	3.42	57.00	12.78

TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
TOTAL ALIENATION BY AGE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Age	745.49	2	5.37	.005
Error	15.38	373		
Linear Trend	1148.06	1	8.69	.005

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
POWERLESSNESS BY AGE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Age	133.00	2	4.69	.01
Error	29.86	373		
Linear Trend	110.08	1	3.93	.05

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
NORMLESSNESS BY AGE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Age	58.70	2	3.93	.05
Error	15.38	373		
Linear Trend	102.60	1	7.04	.01

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SOCIAL ISOLATION BY AGE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Age	110.37	2	4.63	.01
Error	24.22	373		
Linear Trend	198.49	1	8.77	.005

TABLE 6

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY SEX

SEX	NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
MALE N=149	14.22	4.12	23.08	5.71	23.44	4.99	60.49	12.78
FEMALE N=229	14.14	3.77	24.05	5.24	23.62	4.86	61.74	11.43

TABLE 7

MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY MARITAL STATUS

MARITAL STATUS	NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
MARRIED N=288	14.00	3.80	23.50	5.56	23.45	4.99	60.74	12.06
SINGLE N= 63	14.08	4.29	23.67	5.02	23.46	4.82	61.24	22.48
SEP/DIV N= 21	16.10	4.25	25.27	4.92	25.43	4.74	66.81	11.02
WIDOW/ER N= 10	16.00	3.62	26.50	5.48	23.20	3.12	65.60	10.74

TABLE 8

MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES
BY MARITAL STATUS (REVISED)

MARITAL STATUS	NORMLESSNESS	POWERLESSNESS	SOCIAL ISOLATION	TOTAL ALIENATION
MARRIED AND SINGLE	14.01	23.56	23.45	60.83
NO LONGER MARRIED	16.06	25.66	24.71	66.42

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
TOTAL ALIENATION BY MARITAL STATUS

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Marital Status	632.28	1	4.52	.05
Error	144.56	374		

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
POWERLESSNESS BY MARITAL STATUS

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Marital Status	87.07	1	2.95	.05
Error	29.85	374		

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
NORMLESSNESS BY MARITAL STATUS

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Marital Status	87.80	1	5.90	.005
Error	14.88	374		

TABLE 12

MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY COMMUNITY SIZE

COMMUNITY SIZE		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
< 500	N= 48	14.48	4.19	25.17	5.42	24.06	4.59	63.71	11.38
501-1000	N= 27	15.63	3.50	25.60	4.85	23.04	4.64	64.26	11.27
1001-2000	N= 32	14.13	4.00	24.50	6.12	23.66	5.73	62.28	13.94
2001-5000	N= 62	14.07	3.99	24.15	5.87	23.74	5.46	61.95	12.92
5001-50,000	N= 54	13.67	4.00	23.13	4.30	23.85	4.21	60.09	10.14
> 50,000	N=155	14.04	3.80	22.73	5.48	23.28	4.91	59.87	11.98

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
NORMLESSNESS BY COMMUNITY SIZE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Community Size	15.79	5	1.03	n.s.
Error	15.27	372		
Linear Trend	52.62	1	3.53	.058

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
POWERLESSNESS BY COMMUNITY SIZE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Community Size	82.74	5	2.86	0.02
Error	28.94	372		
Linear Trend	332.60	1	11.53	0.001

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1					
GROUP	GP 6	GP 5	GP 4	GP 3	
Mean	22.67	23.13	24.15	24.50	
SUBSET 2					
GROUPS	GP 5	GP 4	GP 3	GP 1	GP 2
Mean	23.13	24.15	24.50	25.17	25.59

TABLE 15

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
TOTAL ALIENATION BY COMMUNITY SIZE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Community Size	193.20	5	1.35	0.24
Error	142.85	372		
Linear Trend	833.72	1	5.88	0.02

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GP 6	GP 5	GP 4	GP 3	GP 1	GP 2
Mean	59.87	60.09	61.95	62.28	62.71	64.26

TABLE 16

MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY EXPERIENCE

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1-5	N=131	14.79	3.82	24.15	5.27	24.71	5.19	63.21	11.81
6-10	N= 98	14.03	3.70	24.17	5.59	23.98	4.78	62.07	11.90
11-15	N= 44	14.11	3.67	23.52	5.32	23.02	3.95	60.71	10.64
15-20	N= 35	14.00	4.17	22.74	5.68	22.34	4.99	59.37	13.07
21-25	N= 41	14.37	4.47	23.49	5.69	22.63	5.06	60.49	12.41
25-30	N= 17	11.24	3.90	21.18	5.41	20.41	3.10	52.82	10.89
> 30	N= 16	13.38	3.95	22.88	4.98	21.25	3.91	57.50	10.15

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
TOTAL ALIENATION BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Years of Experience	360.17	6	2.59	0.02
Error	139.05	375		
Linear Trend	1346.87	1	9.66	0.002

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1						
GROUP	GP 6	GP 7	GP 4			
Mean	52.82	57.50	59.37			
SUBSET 2						
GROUP	GP 7	GP 4	GP 5	GP 3	GP 2	GP 1
Mean	57.50	59.37	60.48	60.70	62.07	63.21

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SOCIAL ISOLATION BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Years of Experience	90.64	6	3.93	0.001
Error	23.06	375		
Linear Trend	335.86	1	14.41	0.000

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1					
GROUP	GP 6	GP 7	GP 4	GP 5	GP 3
Mean	20.41	21.25	22.34	22.63	23.02
SUBSET 2					
GROUP	GP 7	GP 4	GP 5	GP 3	GP 2
Mean	21.25	22.34	22.63	23.02	23.98
SUBSET 3					
GROUP	GP 3	GP 2	GP 1		
Mean	23.02	23.98	24.71		

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
NORMLESSNESS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Years of Experience	35.29	6	2.33	0.03
Error	15.12	375		
Linear Trend	96.87	1	6.36	0.01

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1						
GROUP	GP 6	GP 7				
Mean	11.24	13.38				
SUBSET 2						
GROUP	GP 7	GP 4	GP 2	GP 3	GP 5	GP 1
Mean	13.38	14.00	14.04	14.11	14.37	14.79

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
POWERLESSNESS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Years of Experience	32.52	6	1.11	0.36
Error	29.41	375		
Linear Trend	98.14	1	3.35	0.06

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

GROUP	GP 6	GP 4	GP 7	GP 5	GP 3	GP 2	GP 1
Mean	21.18	22.74	22.88	23.49	23.52	24.08	24.15

TABLE 21

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES
BY YEARS IN PRESENT SCHOOL

YEARS IN PRESENT SCHOOL		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	N=79	14.60	3.84	23.76	4.63	24.37	5.18	62.58	11.24
2	N=67	14.12	4.35	23.24	6.08	23.55	5.43	60.90	13.00
3	N=60	14.58	3.61	24.33	5.44	23.72	4.63	62.82	14.22
4	N=48	14.40	4.43	24.65	6.07	24.13	4.98	62.06	10.87
5-10	N=84	13.75	3.59	23.06	5.36	23.29	4.35	60.06	10.87
11-15	N=30	13.30	4.10	23.57	5.84	21.57	3.99	58.43	12.29
> 16	N=14	14.21	3.68	23.71	4.16	22.14	6.00	60.07	11.48

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SOCIAL ISOLATION BY YEARS IN PRESENT SCHOOL

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Years in Present School	36.95	6	1.55	n.s.
Error	23.92	375		
Linear Trend	125.36	1	5.25	.05

TABLE 23

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES
BY MOBILITY CATEGORIES

MOBILITY		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
0.66- 1.50	N=77	14.89	3.67	24.52	5.01	24.34	4.85	63.61	11.37
1.55- 2.00	N=56	13.65	4.45	23.18	5.77	23.56	4.99	60.40	11.84
2.09- 2.92	N=74	13.85	4.04	22.32	6.17	23.12	5.37	59.27	13.31
3.00- 4.40	N=86	14.15	3.68	24.41	5.11	23.94	4.94	62.10	11.77
4.50-18.00	N=71	13.81	3.84	23.29	4.86	22.40	4.39	59.46	11.29

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SOCIAL ISOLATION BY MOBILITY

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Mobility	42.53	4	1.76	0.14
Error	24.17	363		
Linear Trend	90.37	1	3.74	0.05

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1				
GROUP	GP 5	GP 3	GP 2	GP 4
Mean	22.40	23.12	23.56	23.94
SUBSET 2				
GROUP	GP 3	GP 2	GP 4	GP 1
Mean	23.12	23.56	23.94	24.34

TABLE 25

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES
BY MOBILITY CATEGORIES FEMALES

MOBILITY		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
0.66- 1.50	N=52	14.71	3.39	24.50	4.52	24.56	4.77	63.56	10.80
1.55- 2.00	N=33	14.12	4.18	24.55	5.62	23.94	4.94	62.58	11.15
2.05- 2.92	N=43	14.16	4.04	22.77	5.30	23.88	5.28	60.77	11.67
3.00- 4.40	N=49	13.76	3.46	24.63	5.21	24.06	4.97	62.49	11.35
4.5 -18.00	N=48	13.60	3.90	23.23	5.23	21.58	4.05	58.42	11.55

TABLE 26

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES
BY MOBILITY CATEGORIES MALES

MOBILITY		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
0.66- 1.50	N=27	15.22	4.20	24.56	5.92	23.93	5.05	63.70	12.62
1.55- 2.00	N=24	13.00	4.81	21.29	5.54	23.04	5.14	57.42	12.35
2.09- 2.92	N=31	13.42	4.06	21.71	7.26	22.06	5.38	57.19	15.26
3.00- 4.40	N=37	14.68	3.93	24.11	5.04	23.78	4.95	61.59	12.46
4.5 -18.00	N=24	14.21	3.76	23.42	4.14	24.04	4.68	61.54	10.70

TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SOCIAL ISOLATION BY MOBILITY (FEMALES)

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Mobility	65.13	4	2.83	0.05
Error	23.05	220		
Linear Trend	160.94	1	6.94	0.01

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1				
GROUP	GP 5			
Mean	21.58			
SUBSET 2				
GROUP	GP 3	GP 2	GP 4	GP 1
Mean	23.88	23.94	24.06	24.56

TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
TOTAL ALIENATION BY MOBILITY (FEMALES)

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Mobility	196.27	4	1.54	0.19
Error	127.66	220		
Linear Trend	509.53	1	4.01	0.05

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1				
GROUP	GP 5	GP 3	GP 4	GP 2
Mean	58.42	60.77	62.49	62.58
SUBSET 2				
GROUP	GP 3	GP 4	GP 2	GP 1
Mean	60.77	62.49	62.58	63.56

TABLE 29

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY POSITION

POSITION IN SCHOOL		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Principal	N= 25	14.60	4.10	22.48	6.67	22.84	5.11	59.92	13.78
Vice-Prin	N= 11	13.64	2.01	23.27	3.90	24.64	4.34	61.55	9.29
Dept Head	N= 11	15.00	4.15	24.00	7.23	23.82	4.73	62.82	14.02
Teacher	N=307	14.27	3.85	23.87	5.32	23.61	4.82	61.59	11.64
Counsellor	N= 9	12.33	3.88	21.11	6.08	19.22	3.35	52.67	13.48
Other	N= 19	12.90	5.23	23.90	5.37	24.79	5.57	61.16	13.36

TABLE 30

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
SCHOOL RELATED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8
V1 Training			-0.13**	0.30**	-0.13**	0.33**		0.16**
V2 Years Exp			0.53**		-0.18**		0.46**	
V3 Yrs in Pres School	-0.13**	0.53**					0.62**	
V4 Staff Size	0.30**				0.19**	0.43**		-0.16**
V5 Position	-0.13**	-0.18**		0.19**		0.13*		
V6 Grade Level	0.53**			0.43**	0.13*			-0.19**
V7 Mobility		0.46**	0.62**					
V8 Prev Occ.	-0.16**			-0.16**		-0.19**		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 31

MEAN SCORES FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY TRAINING

YEARS OF TRAINING		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	N= 42	13.43	3.35	24.74	5.54	23.86	5.08	61.74	11.23
2	N= 43	13.98	3.85	24.26	5.51	23.35	4.42	61.58	11.89
3	N= 55	15.27	3.64	24.66	5.08	24.64	5.02	63.73	12.03
4	N=151	14.13	3.94	23.13	5.05	23.42	4.83	60.63	11.46
5	N= 51	14.12	4.13	23.47	5.92	23.49	5.59	61.16	13.00
6	N= 22	13.91	3.97	22.32	4.89	22.36	4.42	58.68	10.98
>6	N= 18	14.11	5.30	24.22	7.91	22.78	4.61	61.11	15.68

TABLE 32

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY STAFF SIZE

SIZE OF STAFF		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
< 5	N=19	15.47	3.70	25.53	6.25	23.32	3.85	64.32	11.91
5- 9	N=26	12.96	3.59	22.96	5.50	22.50	5.39	58.12	11.69
10- 14	N=55	13.84	3.93	24.71	5.34	23.86	4.96	62.36	11.94
15- 19	N=54	13.30	2.95	24.00	4.34	24.46	4.81	61.61	9.60
20- 24	N=64	15.22	4.13	24.36	5.92	23.47	5.18	62.30	12.95
25- 30	N=53	15.26	3.90	23.26	5.12	23.85	4.47	62.55	11.91
31- 50	N=66	13.67	4.27	22.88	6.12	22.99	5.36	59.55	13.31
51-100	N=31	13.74	3.56	23.10	4.58	23.71	4.73	60.52	10.29
> 100	N=14	14.07	4.90	21.27	5.23	22.71	4.45	58.07	12.71

TABLE 33

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
POWERLESSNESS BY STAFF SIZE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Staff Size	41.23	8	1.41	0.19
Error	29.21	373		
Linear Trend	142.04	1	4.87	0.03

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GP 9	GP 2	GP 7	GP 8	GP 6	GP 4	GP 5
Mean	21.28	22.62	22.88	23.10	23.26	24.00	24.36
GROUP	GP 3	GP 1					
Mean	24.71	25.53					

TABLE 34

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
NORMLESSNESS BY STAFF SIZE

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Staff Size	33.93	8	2.26	0.02
Error	15.04	373		

TABLE 35

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY GRADE LEVEL

GRADE LEVEL		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Elementary	N=188	14.20	3.65	23.98	5.47	23.66	4.78	61.76	11.43
Jr High	N= 93	14.28	4.56	23.80	5.60	23.01	4.99	60.59	13.24
Sr High	N= 92	14.05	3.79	23.03	5.32	23.94	5.18	61.12	11.80
Other	N= 9	14.22	4.60	23.67	4.77	22.67	4.21	60.33	11.14

TABLE 36

MEAN SCORES ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES
BY PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

STATUS		NORMLESSNESS		POWERLESSNESS		SOCIAL ISOLATION		TOTAL ALIENATION	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Had Previous Work	(113)	13.51	3.82	22.82	5.24	23.11	4.21	59.05	10.93
No Previous Work	(265)	14.45	3.92	24.02	5.50	23.74	5.17	62.18	12.30

TABLE 37

t-TESTS ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES
BY PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

VARIABLE	T	dF	p
Normlessness	-2.16	216.44	.03
Powerlessness	-1.99	221.36	.04
Social Isolation	-1.25	257.59	n.s.
Total Alienation	-2.45	236.32	.01

TABLE 38

MEAN SCORES ON PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY POSITION IN SCHOOL

	MEAN	SD
POSITION		
Principal	14.68	2.82
Vice-principal	15.09	1.51
Co-ordinators	14.18	2.04
Teachers	13.66	2.84

TABLE 39

MEAN SCORES ON PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY SEX

	MEAN	SD
SEX		
Males	14.17	2.67
Females	13.44	2.91
TOTAL SAMPLE	13.74	2.85

TABLE 40

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY POSITION IN SCHOOL

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Position in School	15.08	3	1.93	n.s.
Error	7.81	346		
Linear Trend	27.56	1	3.53	.05

TABLE 41

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PERCEIVED INFLUENCE BY SEX

BETWEEN GROUPS	MS	dF	F	p
Sex	51.48	1	6.50	.01
Error	7.93	373		